DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 324 UD 014 114

AUTHOR Moran, Roberto E.
TITLE The Roots of Prejudice; Also Reflections on the Book "Racial Awareness in Children."
INSTITUTION Puerto Rico Univ., Rio Piedras. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE 69
NOTE 57p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Aggression; *Bias; Book Reviews; *Childhood Attitudes; Individual Characteristics; *Individual Development; Literature Reviews; Personality Development; Psychological Patterns; *Racial Attitudes; Racial Characteristics; *Racial Discrimination; Social Discrimination; Social Factors; Socialization

ABSTRACT

This essay, an attempt to trace the roots of prejudice, addresses such questions as: What is prejudice? Is it a unitary construct? Are the terms 'prejudice', 'segregation', 'discrimination' synonomous? Is prejudice innate or acquired? Is there a 'prejudiced personality-type', or is anyone capable of becoming prejudiced? Are prejudiced people more, or less, maladjusted than non-prejudiced ones? Why do some men have dark skin, and what natural function can dark skin possibly have, and so on? Seeking answers to these and other questions leads to the primary concern: the source of racial prejudice. In what layer of man's self are to be found the roots of his prejudice toward his fellow men? The approach is essentially inductive, beginning with the particular--man as a biological unit--and proceeding to the general--man as a societal abstraction. The book--Racial Awareness in Young Children--reports, in non-technical language, a study which was begun in 1943 and concluded in 1948. It may be viewed as an important bridge between those studies which were primarily seeking an understanding of the development of racial prejudice, and those which were concerned with the personality concomitant of racial prejudice. The author's (Dr. Goodman's) focus, though ostensibly eclectic, is basically that of the cultural anthropologist. Through a series of intensive case studies, Dr. Goodman investigates the complex process underlying intergenerational persistence of the culturally predominant pattern of "White" over "Black." (Author/JM)

ED 090324

THE ROOTS OF PREJUDICE

also

Reflections on the book

Racial Awareness in Children

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

College of Education
University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras, P. R.

1969

UD 014114

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pages

PART I

Introduction 1

PART II

Definition of Terms 4

Phylogenetic Origin of Prejudice 8
Discussion 9

The Origin of Skin Color 10

Anthropological Origin of Prejudice 11

Aggression and Prejudice 12
Origin of Aggression 12
Social Organization and Aggression 13

Sociological Origin of Prejudice 17

Historical Origin of Prejudice 21
Historical background 21

Up from Slavery 23

Psychological Origin of Prejudice 24
Individual Concept of Behavior 24
Behaviorist theory 26
Neo-Behaviorist theory 26
General psychological theory 27
Social psychological or "Scape-Goat" theory 29
Psychoanalytical theory 29

The Theory of Authoritarian Personality 30

Racial Awareness in Children 34

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
Recommendations	38
Bibliography	41
Appendix	42
Reflections on the book Racial Awareness in Young Children	42

THE ROOTS OF PREJUDICE

PART I

Introduction

This essay is an attempt to trace the roots of prejudice: it is not an attempt to extirpate them. For the roots of prejudice run deeply and are widely dispersed, and to map out their beginings and endings will take us far afield into various branches of the natural and social sciences. Each of these disciplines provides a wealth of material from which to uncover and trace these roots. Hypotheses and theories on race prejudice abound. Exhaustive studies in the area of race, the genesis of racial differences, and the attitude of man throughout the ages toward these differences, have been made. For the study of racial prejudice involves the study of the history of man himself, both phylogenetically, i. e., man's racial evolution, and ontogenetically, his individual development from birth onwards. Though scholars in the various disciplines have contributed greatly to our knowledge of race... "the fact of the matter is that geneticists, biologists, anthropologist et. al., do not as yet know enough about race to draw any conclusions about racial differences". [1] Neither have sociologists, psychologists and psychiatrists, including psychoanalysts, provided conclusive and objective evidence on the causes of racial prejudice. For in the final analysis racial prejudice is a reflection of man's most intimate feelings, and no scientific instrument has yet been devised which can isolate these for objective scrutiny in order to determine their component parts, their modus operandi or how they can be changed to conform to the norms of a given society. All behavior is a reflection of man's individuality, and this cannot be studied by science, but only by history, art, or biography whose methods are not nomothetic (seeking universal laws) but idiographic.

Thus this essay will be limited to providing part answers to such questions as: What is prejudice? Is it a unitary construct?

---

1. Silberman, C., "Crises in Black and White," Random House, New York, 1964. p. 72.

Are the terms 'prejudice', 'segregation', 'discrimination' synonymnos? Is prejudice innate or acquired? Is there a 'prejudiced personality-type', or is any one capable of becoming prejudiced? Is a person who is anti-American also anti-Negro and anti-Semitic? Are prejudiced people more, or less, maladjusted than non-prejudiced ones? Why do some men have dark skin and what natural function can dark skin possibly have, and so on? Seeking answers to these and other questions we are inevitably led to our primary and greatest concern, i. e., the source of racial prejudice. In what layer of man's self are to be found the roots of his prejudice toward his fellow men?

The first problem is a formidable one, i. e., where does one begin his search? My approach will be essentially an inductive one, beginning with the particular —man as a biological unit— and proceeding to the general —man as a societal abstraction. It might well have been an autobiographical treatise. That is, a soul-searching study of my own experiences, feelings, and reaction to social prejudice might reveal invaluable insight not readily attained by more objective, academic-type studies. For surely one's individual experiences and feelings would provide a more authentic picture of racial prejudice than that obtained from interviews, questionnaires and observations, which at most provide us with superficial expressions of overt behavior. Undoubtedly the autobiographical approach is an indispensable medium for uncovering subjective material. But the evidence gathered from autobiographies, (as that obtained by other methods) must always be open to question. For too often the autobiographer's account is 'blinkered' and, perhaps unconsciously, he omits, limits and edits his material. An author's perception, his own individual prejudices, will always seep into his account, and he may be more interested in impressing his readers or grinding his own axe, than in providing an objective picture of racial prejudice. I have tried to avoid these pitfalls by documenting this essay with observations of others who share my concern with the search for the roots of prejudice.

My interest in racial prejudice to the extent of seeking its causes(s) began, strangely, enough not in race-conscious Britain or North America where I resided for several years but in Puerto Rico, a Latin-American country where racial prejudice supposedly does not exist. During a holiday spent in Puerto Rico

while studing in England I met a West Indian colleague who was very distressed because her children had been told by their Puerto Rican classmates that their mother was "black and ugly" (Tu mamá es negra y fea). This statement she viewed as an indication of the existing racial prejudice in Puerto Rico even among the professionals who were teaching her children at the University elementary school. Deeply impressed by my colleague's grievance I asked myself: Was this statement indeed a sign of racial prejudice? Could it be true that at such an early age —seven or eight— children are racially prejudiced? and, "When does racial awareness become racial prejudice?"

On my return to my studies in England my interest in prejudice became more acute when conversing (or overhearing conversation) with members of the course for the education of maladjusted children, which I was then taking at the University of London, England. One presumes that persons interested in helping children with problems would be liberal minded and flexible in their thinking and sympathetic in their feelings towards people who are "different". Yet the vast majority of these English professionals were vociferous in their anti-American feelings and some of the most "liberal" were the most anti! For example, one member of the course actually, refused to read a particular book because the author was an American. But, one may ask, is being anti-American a sign of prejudice? My concern was vividly brought out in the controversial play "US" when one character dramatically poses the same question: "Is being anti-American a socielly accepted way of expressing anti-Semitic or anti-Negro feelings?" What are we to think when one member of a group of mature graduate students of psychology out wardly states, "I wouldn't want them (Negroes) living next to me?" This surely is prejudice, or is it? Or when pointing out the sign —"We reserve the right of admission"— on a pub frequented by the group, one member exclaimed in a jocular tone, "This means no Black men allowed", and then laughingly points to me. Another member of the group, who sincerely felt she was free of any racial prejudice, recounted to me her profound feelings of guilt when, during a train ride, she deliberately chose to sit in a compartment with a 'white' man rather than with a Negro. The same student was amazed that people didn't stare at her when accompanying a Negro in a store. Yet another related in detail his escapades carried out in the

Jewish section of East London when he was a student-member of the British Fascist party. On analyzing my own feelings about race I suddently realized that I personally do not like East Indians or people with German accents. Yet I have many friends from both groups. Undoubtedly all the cases cited here are instances of racial awareness in persons who outwardly express liberal ideals, tolerance and a preference for a class-free society. Their inclination is "Left", they vote for the Labour party, and they are —with one exception— strongly against the war in Vietnam. They protest against nuclear armament and some have even marched from Aldermaston.[1] And one proudly states that she purposely sits next to colored people when travelling. But is her reaction to colored people less indicative of racial awareness than that of the one who preferred to sit by a 'white' man? More important still: is a dislike for a particular ethnic group or an awareness of race tantamount to having racial prejudice? The attempt to answer these questions provides the core around which this essay is written. I offer no other brief than this, I make no apology, and I offer no final solutions.

PART II

Definition of Terms

In order to prevent ambiguity, I must set out a clear definition of the terms used in this essay. My main concern is with discovering the roots of racial prejudice as these are applied to the so-called 'Colored'. 'Black' or Negro people. These three terms will be used interchangeably. I realize that other ethnic groups are also the victims of prejudice, especially the Jews. The genesis of anti-semitism and anti-negroism may (or may not) be the same and some of the material cited in this essay was taken from research carried out in a attempt to isolate insolate the determinants of prejudice towards Jews.[2] Though the roots of prejudice in both instances may spring from a common source, the paths these take, the way in which they

1. A Center in England for Nuclear Arms Experimentation.
2. Adorno, T. W. et al, "The Authoritarian Personality Science Ed., John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1964.

branch out, and the fruit they finally bear, as shown in man's overt behavior, may be determined by quite different factors specially when this prejudice is seen in countries such as Great Britain and North American. The most significant and influential of these factors is the one of color, "BLACK". For we shall see that "black" is more than a descriptive term: it is a highly emotionally charged word which has deep psychological connotations. The color black is that which essentially sets those who possess it apart from other men for they must forever bear the indelible "Mark of Oppression". [1] Nevertheless, a study of the causes of prejudice towards Jews would surely be as worthy, and possibly more complex, than one of prejudice toward Negroes. "Racial intolerance is the same terrible thing no matter what its source or whoever its victim." Limitation of time prevents my tackling the subject in the present essay. Thus my use of "race" is a limited term and certainly not a scientific one. Rather it is the popular one held by the "man in the street". To attempt a definition of race and to classify scientifically the members of each racial group is certainly beyond the scope of this essay. For, although there has been for some time a universal interest in racial problems, this so far has not been accompanied by anything like universal agreement as to the meaning of race. "Race" has been defined as"... a large group of men possessing in common certain physical characteristics which are determined by heredity." This definition for our purposes is practically meaningless, for the people who are described as suffering from racial prejudice in this essay range in skin color from rosy-white, blue eyes and blond hair to ebony-black, with all the possible gradations of color and combinations of skin color, hair type and other physical features.* Indeed they may even belong to the "White" or Caucasian Race as in the case of Hindus, East Indians and Pakistanis who, in Britain, are classified as "colored". Thus some "blacks" have features ascribed to the Caucasoids ("white"), others will resemble Mongoloids (American Indians) while others are unmistakably

---

1. The term is taken from the book Mark of Oppression by Kardiner, A. and Oveseay, L. The World Publ. Co. Cleveland, 1962.

* It is interesting to note that in Puerto Rico, "Negrito" is used as a term of endearment by white and dark Puerto Ricans alike; and "una persona bien colorada" is a very white or reddish individual.

Negroid. Therefore, a "black" man or Negro is one who is perceived as such by himself and by the dominant group in which he lives and is treated as such regardless of his skin color and other physical features. [1] The point will be discussed in more detail elsewhere in this essay.

The term "prejudice" has been well defined by the American social psychologist, G. W. Allport. [2] "Prejudice is a feeling favorable or unfavorable toward a person or thing prior to, or not based on actual experiences, and without sufficient warrant." It is essentially a pre-judgement, one formed without due examination or consideration of the facts. And when these are examined, the reaction of the prejudiced person does not change. It is exemplified in the behavior of the landlady who refuses all prospective colored tenants, merely because of their color, although she may have had no previous experience, bad or good, with colored people. It is seen in the reaction of the white workmen who refuse to work with black workmen even in a coal mine where all faces are "black". More subtly it is seen in social discrimination. [3] Ethnic prejudice is possibly a more correct term than racial prejudice. This is "... an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole, or toward an individual because he is a member of that group"; In this essay "prejudice" will always connote a negative action or thought. One may be prejudiced only in his thoughts which, because of circumstances, may never be converted to deeds. When prejudiced thoughts do manifest themselves in overt behavior they usually do so in the form of social discrimination which is the acting out of prejudiced thoughts. Generally, social discrimination implies

---

1. The variety of colors especially amongst North and South American Negroes is not surprising since the vast majority of them have, in varying degrees, genes from other racial groups. Many Latins are darker than some American Negroes, however, they would never refer to them as Black.
2. See G. W. Allport, "The Nature of Prejudice," pp. 5 - 10.
3. This is especially applicable to Latin American Countries where social discrimination is more apparent than racial prejudice as this term is used in North America. For example, in Latin America most persons of high society or professional, are white although opportunities exist for persons of any color.

distinctions of an active sort. A person is said to "discriminate" against another person "if he refuses or neglects on the grounds of color, race or ethnic or national origins, to afford him like treatment in the like manner and in the like terms to that afforded to any other person". It is essentially an unfair or injurious distinction: the objective evidence of subjective (prejudiced) feelings. Like "prejudice", discrimination in this essay is considered in its negative sense.

"Segregation" like "discrimination" is an acting out process which refers to "an exclusion on grounds that are irrelevant to the putative functions or aims of a group." To some degree it is the natural expression of group identity and function. There are varieties of segregation in all societies which in many cases are self-imposed. People with a common bond such as language, religion or origin of birth and social status will tend to segregate themselves. It is only when a person or a group is forced by law, or group-pressure to certain prescribed restrictions, does segregation have the same negative connotation as prejudice and discrimination. Here our usage refers exclusively to racial segregation which is the restriction of opportunities for different types of association between the members of one "(racial) ... group and those of other groups which results from or is supported by the actions of any official body or agency representing some brand of government".[1] 'Segregation' and 'discrimination' are "legalized" prejudice. Prejudice is what one feels; discrimination is how one treats; and segregation is when these feelings and treatment are supported by law, tradition or common custom.

From time to time the term 'minority group' will be used. This term is often a misnomer as a minority group numerically may be in the majority. It seldom, if ever, refers to the group of people who are the smallest in number in a given society, rather it is used in a sociological context. Thus, "a minority is a group of people who because of their physical or cultural characteristics are singled out from the others in society in which they live, for differential and unequal treatment, and who

1. Rose, A. M., and Rose, C. B., Editors, Minority Problems, Harper & Row, New York, 1965, p. 16.

therefore regard themselves as objects of collective discrimination". (op. cit. p. 22) In this essay minority always refers to Negroes.

There are three other terms which are often used interchangeably, possibly because each is contained in the expression, "I believe..." These are 'opinions' 'beliefs' and 'attitudes'. However, I feel that there are subtle but real differences in the meaning of each term, although this difference may not be recognized or ascertained from the verbalized expression. For example, when one says "I believe all Negroes are lazy", he may be stating an opinion, a belief, or expressing a feeling or attitude about Negroes. Opinons, beliefs and attitudes (and prejudices) all contain cognitive and emotive elements but each in different proportions. An opinion has a much larger cognitive than emotive content. It is more rational than emotional, whether based on correct or erroneous evidence. In the presence of a convincing argument, or the presentation of 'facts', an opinion may change. A belief has a higher proportion of emotional content, is more irrational, and hence demands a greater amount of evidence, facts or proof in order to effect a change of mind. Beliefs are emotionally-loaded opinions and as Storr puts it, "They require a change not only of thought, but of heart, to alter them". An attitude, like prejudice, is a feeling process, and thus constitutes an expression of man's emotional system. It is therefore highly resistant to change, even in the face of the most convincing, scientifically-based argument. Thus a 'white' man, because of group pressure or other reasons, may ostensibly change his opinion and or beliefs about Negroes as a group, or about a particular Negro, but his attitude (and subsequent behavior) towards Negroes may not alter. On being presented with evidence, a white person might say: "Admittedly many Negroes are quite decent fellows, especially after you get to know them a little better. Nevertheless, I still wouldn't want them to live near me, work in my job or belong to my club." Beliefs are an intricate part of prejudice for without them a hostile attitude towards a group or person could not be sustained.

Phylogenetic Origin of Prejudice

The search for the roots of racial prejudice has led to a brief excursion in the fields of ecology —the branch of biology

that deals with the manifold reciprocal relations of the organism to its natural surroundings which includes all other animals and plants native to the environment; anthropology —the science of the evolution of races; and its branch, ethnology, which deals with the comparative customs of varios peoples, including their distribution, characteristics, folkways and so forth; sociology, and history. This is a phylogenetic approach from which we shall proceed to an ontogenetic one.

To claim that a man is prejudiced we are merely making a description and not an explanation of a phenomenon. A descriptive account of prejudice and its diverse manifestations in different people would undoubtedly be enlightening. However, as Beebe expressed it, "The 'isness' of things is well worth studying but it is their 'whyness' that makes life worth living". The 'whyness' of prejudice it seems will only be found in the 'whyness' of man himself. His evolution, development, and the origin of racial differences must all be looked into if we expect to obtain some idea as to the roots of his prejudice. "Man is part of the universe therefore his behavior also obeys the laws of nature."

Discussion

We may begin our phylogenetic study of man by reviewing briefly the theories of evolution. Further on in this essay I shall show how the dark color of the Negro's skin is one of the primary stimuli of racial awareness. It also identifies him, thereby enhancing his becoming a target for man's aggression and hostility. It perpetuates his humble position in both North and South American societies, since neither he nor the 'white' members of his society can ever forget his 'up from slavery' origin. Virtually all ethnic groups at some time during their history were captured as slaves and carried to foreign lands. When master and slave belonged to the same racial group, on being freed, the latter eventually became indistinguishable from the former. The freed slave could inter-marry with members of his master's race and become integrated into society. The free Negro, marked by the color of his skin, has been denied the rights and privileges of free men of other races. He was segregated when a slave; he has yet to become fully integrated, though technically "free", in the Americas, for over a hundred years. We may rightfully ask: "Why

then are some men 'black'? What purpose can 'blackness' of skin possibly have, since many who possess it, ipso facto are grossly handicapped in their physical, mental and social growth and development. Black skin though poorly serving its bearer in modern Anglo-American societies must surely at one time have played an essential role in the black man's survival. The emergence of every organ or trait is to aid in the survival of the species. Each trait, including skin color, must have a function. This is a biological principle. "We know that it is the function of an organ that alters its form, in the sense of functional improvement; and when, owing to a small, in itself fortuitous, hereditary change, an organ becomes a little better and more efficient the bearer of this character, and his descendants, will set a standard with which other, less talented members of his species cannot compete; thus in the course of time those less fit to survive will disappear from the earth's surface". The 'black' man obviously survived and his number is steadily increasing.

Nevertheless, blackness of skin, it seems, is contrary to the laws of evolution. We shall see in our psychological study of racial awareness in children, that children —black and white— by the age of four are curious to know why some people are 'black'. The white child asks this of the Negro one, and the Negro one of himself. Whether a scientific answer to a child's question may deter racial prejudice in adulthood is debatable. However, the more sensitive, intelligent Negro or 'white' adolescent may rightfully demand a scientific explanation of the origin of racial difference. And his parent or teacher should be able to offer him one.

The Origin of Skin Color

It has long been held that skin color has an adaptive value. Thus, in the long term, the primary factor in the creation of racial differences is selection. The evolution of races, according to modern genetics, is due to mutation, selection and genetic drift. These three constructors of evolution are all influenced by man's culture. "Race" is therefore more a cultural concept than a genetic one, if it is a concept at all. Selection has a survival value and is the result of reproductive success. In man, reproductive success is primarily determined by the social system, and by culture. Genetic drift also depends on culture,

since migration is influenced by the size of the population, transportation facilities, economy, warfare and other cultural determinants. Thus, one theory of the origin of 'black' people is that because of migration and evolution (including mutation) those men who arrived and survived in hot climates, in the course of perhaps a million years, adapted by means of mutation and selection a type and skin color most suitable to their environment. The sun (ultra-violet rays) over the years brought about an increase in the amount of melanin —coloring agent— in the skin preventing the penetration of ultra-violet light. Recently it has been suggested that this is an oversimplified explanation of the origin of skin coloring which is a far more complicated process. Melanin in the skin, it seems, does not do what anthropologists have said it has done. The part of the skin which mainly stops ultra-violet light, the short-wave length light, is a thickened stratum corneum, rather than melanin.

Whether it is the melanin or the thickened stratum corneum is a moot point; what is pimportant is the fact that, scientifically, there exists no grounds for claiming that one skin color is inferior or superior to another. There is no cause for shame in being black. All 'black' children should know this so that when asked, "Why are you black"?, they may answer without shame or pride, "For the same reason that your are white".

Anthropological Origin of Prejudice

Prejudice has long been justified by many on the grounds that in the hierarchy of man's racial evolution and development the Negro holds the lowest position. He has therefore been considered more closely akin to the apes and consequently "It is is right that he is treated as such". As late as 40 years ago, we find serious anthropologists and historians postulating the theory of polygenesis —that each race had a separate beginning— and in their writings they wittingly or unwittingly provide fuel for the fire of the racists. The history of colonization and slavery in the American offers a vivid example of how a misunderstanding of scientific writings or premature conclusions based on shaky evidence, can bring about lasting effects in a particular science. It was not a racial bigot who wrote that.... "the Negro and the gorilla are closely related and descended from one ancestral

stock of ape-men".[1] However, this theory was soon accepted by segregationists as a fact, and interpreted (or misinterpreted) by them as meaning that the Negro was physically and mentally inferior to the "white" man.

Even when the polygenetic theory was replaced by a monogenetic one —the concept of a single origin of man— attempts were continuously made to construct a human family tree with its various branches in an evolutionary order. The Caucasian race is represented as flowering at the top, the Mongolian in the middle, and the Negro at the bottom, close to the primitive roots of the tree. To support this chronological order of racial evolution it was customary to point out the primitive traits in the Negro's physiognomy and color such as dark pigmentation, prognathism (projecting jaw), receding forehead, and low, broad nose, etc. —which presumably indicate his closer kinship to the ape. Residues of this belief are heard even today when the 'white' man refers to Negroes as the 'black apes' or 'monkeys'. Needless to say there is no scientific evidence for claiming racial superiority or inferiority on the basis of an evolutionary priority of racial genesis. Nevertheless, these erroneous, obsolete beliefs offer a fertile ground for the dissemination of those seeds from which will spring roots of prejudice. For there are those who will tenaciously hold on to a belief of the innate inferiority of the Negro, even in the light of the most recent findings of the anthropologist, archeologist and others.

AGGRESSION AND PREJUDICE

Origin of Aggression

The only objective evidence we have of man's feelings is when these are reflected in some pattern of his overt behavior. For an individual to be classified as racially prejudiced he must have, on some occasion, acted out his feelings —in word or deed— toward members of a given race or toward the race as a group. In most cases racial feelings are manifested by some form of aggressive or hostile act. In a subdued form the aggressive

1. Quoted in "Race Differences," Klineberg, O. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1935. p. 12.

attitudes are seen in such the signs as "Nigger Go Home"; or more overtly, in frank and open racial violence and riots. Racial prejudice is certainly not synonymous with racial violence, but where there is the former, there is imminent danger of the latter. In fact the incidence of racial violence is usually a yardstick for measuring racial prejudice in a country. However, it is claimed by some that in North America there is less racial prejudice than in England, but more racial violence. An analysis of a prejudicial act would reveal that aggression is one of its primary components. An eminent psychiatrist stated, "Race prejudice is learned but (it) can be learned only because it has an apt and inherent pupil in the prideful and instinctively selfwilled aggressive aspect of each one of us". To understand the genesis of prejudice we must study the origin of its most important part, i.e., aggression. In order to do this we must again review man's evolution. Since aggression is an intricate part of man's being it must have evolved, like other traits, to serve him in his struggle for survival. "Aggression... is an instinct like any other and in natural conditions it helps just as much as any other to ensure the survival of the individual and the species." Its purpose can be deduced from its function in other vertebrates. Thus, the origin of aggression, its purpose, expression, the manner of its displacement and so forth become more meaningful when we trace its path downward to the very genesis of vertebrate behavior. If we can discover how the basic units of primary vertebrates' behavior have been modified by nature in order that they may survive we may come up with some suggestions as to how to reduce aggression in man, and by so doing reduce racial prejudice and violence. Prejudice when stripped of its aggressive component becomes sterile and meaningless since it would then be deprived of the vitality which perpetuates it.

Social Organizations and Aggression

The origin of aggression can be traced to three or four types of social organization found in vertebrates. According to Lorenz, [1] "The first type of social organization is the anonymous crowd, which is free of all kinds of aggression, but also lacks the personal awareness and cohesion of individuals". We find it hard to envisage a society or group of men completely void

1. Lorenz, K., "On Aggression", Metheun Co. Ltd., London, 1966. p. xii.

of some social contact. However, psychologically men can and do isolate themselves from other men. Man is able to withdraw from reality but in doing so he ceases to contribute to society. (A group of painters, for example, may be temporarily withdrawn from reality, feel no prejudice, but the very act of painting contains some aggression, and in itself a means by which the artist is communicating with his fellow man). A group of sleeping, unconscious, psychotic or dead men would, it seems, constitute the closest parallel to an 'anonymous crowd'. In such a group racial prejudice would be nonexistent. "The second is the family and social life... the only structural basis of which is territorial —the defense of a given area".[1] It is within this social framework that we begin to see aggressive forces at work. This is seen even in the most primitive of the vertebrates —fish, as well as in the most advanced species— apes and man. Lorenz observed that, "Every one of the crowd (of fish) is determined that no other fish of his species should settle in his territory. Among animals this position, the territorial 'border', is in no way marked on the ground but is determined exclusively by a 'show of power'...". [2] As long as family size permits sufficient food for each member, aggression as such is not manifested. "Never have I seen fish of two different species attacking each other, even if both are highly aggressive by nature. Their furious attack is directed toward members of their own species only, except, of course, in the case of predatory fish in which the motive is hunger and not real aggressiveness". [3] "Color in fish elicits furious reactions of territorial defense in every fish of the same species —and only of the same species— when the reacting individual is in its own territory; and to the intruder encroaching on foreign ground it proclaims fear inspiring readiness to fight". "... As 'babies', fish are furious defenders of their territory, but as adults they are far more peaceful". [4] 'Black' and 'white' men are members of the same species, and so the prejudiced man is reacting to color as fish do —and baby fish at that!

The third family type is what Lorenz terms the 'large family', the members of which do not recognize one another as individuals

1. Lorenz, op. cit. p. xii.
2. Ibid p. xii.
3. Ibid p. 7.
4. Ibid p. 29.

but by the tribal smell, and whose social behavior towards one another is exemplary, whilst they attack with bitter hatred every member of the species that belongs to a different tribe.

"The fourth type of social organization is that in which it is the bond of love and friendship between individuals which prevents the members of the society from fighting and harming one another".[1] Few, if any, societies composed of different races, ethnic or religious groups, have achieved anything like this goal, although according to Lorenz, some animals such as the greylag goose have done so.

Because of their common ancestor in the evolutionary process, man and anthropoids are more closely related than man and fish or greese. However, man has supposedly reached a superior level of development, especially in the cognitive areas. As a result of his higher mental abilities, his greater capacity for learning, and his ability to make his emotions subservient to cognition, we would expect to find among men less aggression, intolerance, and hostility than among apes. This does not seem to be the case. Hall, who studied closely societies of monkeys and apes, found that on the whole relationships between groups of different species of apes or monkeys are characterized by mutual tolerance or mutual avoidance according to the nature of the habitat. However, in the unnatural restriction of physical and social space of the usual captivity conditions, lethal aggressiveness may occur. Hall cites an example of this when he describes the fighting which broke out in a group of 17 baboons when an 'alien' adult male and adult female were introduced in their midst. "Most of the animals were killed or died of their injuries".

The behavior of the apes toward an 'alien' member of their species is analogous to the racial violence, riots and lynching, which occur when men of different race are forced to live in the unnatural social conditions of our urban societies. In these city jungles artificial boundaries are set up to keep each group in its place. When groups of apes do overlap, they usually avoid contact, but when contact is unavoidable severe in-group fighting may break out. Man's behavior in similar

1. Lorenz, op. cit. p. 29.

circumstances, despite his superior intellect, is remarkably similar to, if not worse than, if that of apes.

Man, it seems, has inherited his intra-specie aggressiveness, his desire for social distance, his intolerance for the 'alien', directly from his vertebrate ancestors. And racial prejudice and violence seem to be the manifestation of this legacy. The prejudiced individual therefore is one who is the unfortunate victim of his most primary and basic instinct —aggression— which he has been quite unable to channelize into more fruitful actions. It is interesting that the greatest amount of aggression and hostility is directed at members of the same species rather than those of a different species. A white man may love his black dog, and despise his 'black' neighbor. It would appear that intra-specie aggression would be contra-indicative to the natural law of species survival. For surely if members of one species direct all their aggressiveness and hostility inwardly toward members of the same species rather than outwardly toward those of different species, they would, in time annihilate each other. Actually, among animals this does not occur. Firstly, it has been observed that the aim of aggression has never been that of the extermination of fellow members of the species concerned. Secondly, the Darwin theory of species-survival function of the animals' organs and traits is equally applicable to aggression. "Aggression leading to fighting is due to (the fact that) it is always favorable to the future of the species if the stronger of two kinds takes possession of the territory of the desired female" [1] (10. p. 23). Sexuality in the lower animals plays a powerfull role in specie-survival. Sexuality in man, the struggle for the female, has also been found to be one of the moving forces of racial prejudice and racial violence. There is a wide-spread belief among the white population that the Negro's desire for integration is so that Negro men may have intercourse with white women. The fear of racial intermarriage is so strong that in some areas of North America (the South) the death penalty may be given to a Negro man for having intimate relations with a white woman. Thus the fear that the Negro man may prove the stronger of the two kinds and thereby take possession of the female is another cause of racial prejudice which traces its roots to the very beginning of man's evolution.

1. Lorenz, op. cit. p. 23.

All aggression is not sexually motivated. It may have an ecological origin. Viewed in this light; "... aggression is due to the danger of too dense a population of an animal species settling in one part of the available biotope and exhausting all its sources of nutrition and so starving can be obviated by a mutual repulsion acting in the animals of the same species, effecting their regular spacing out".[1] Amongst white men, the economic struggle for existance, the real or unconscious fear that the Negroes (or other foreign elements) will replace their jobs, and thus deprive them of their subsistence, is another factor of racial prejudice. In densely populated urban areas where 'Black' and 'White' are competing for jobs and homes, in times of economic depression racial prejudice and violence are highest. In sparsely populated agricultural areas where there is food and space for all, racial differences are minimized. The roots of prejudice might well spring from the intra-species competition found in all animals and which Lorenz describes as 'the root of all evil'.

The study of animals undoubtedly contributes to our knowledge of human behavior. But these studies have their limitations and findings based on studies of animals should be carefully evaluated before applying them to men. Students of animals behavior —like those of human behavior— are limited to observing only a small sample of a species, and their findings are influenced, perhaps unconsciously, by their own human foibles. Observation is a perceptual process, and perception is influenced by one's experiences; it always contains an emotional as well as rational element. Therefore, a researcher may be projecting human qualities on animal behavior. Though the roots of prejudice may have their genesis in animals, the manner in which these branch out and come to fruit in man is our greatest concern. A study of the history of man, how he reacts to other men in his society, and the dynamic factors which motivate his action, should provide a further source for revealing the roots of prejudice.

Sociological Origin of Prejudice

Man is a social animal, his behavior influences, and is influenced, in turn by the society in which he lives. The collective

1. Ibid p. 24.

behavior exhibited by a group is a sociological phenomenon and one not readly explained by biological and anthropological theories. Neither can psychology or psychiatry offer conclusive answers to the phenomenon of group-behavior. For the pressure of a society (or group) may be so strong that a basically non-prejudiced individual may be led to discriminate against members of a minority group or against the group itself. Sociologists claim that prejudice needs to be studied in the context of societal rather than individual problems or pathologies. Therefore the sociologists would search for the roots of prejudice not in the individual but in his society in which racial prejudice has become a norm among the dominant group. Such a society is exemplified by North America where it is claimed that "approximately eighty per-cent of the population have some appreciable degree of racial prejudice". [1] "Racial prejudices are so pervasive and latent throughout the North American culture, that one should question the value of a search for distinct characteristics in the individual personality that may lead to the development of prejudice". [2] Cultural influences and societal pressures are, according to sociologists, greater determinants of racial prejudice than personality traits. "A culture that predisposes the individual to develop some form of prejudice would exert its influences to a certain degree on all individuals with little regard to their traits of personality or their infantile experiences". Yunger has pointed out that the prejudice of the dominant group will have continual reinforcement which deepens it and justifies further discrimination, which in turn gives reinforcement to the prejudice of minorities. "There are varieties of segregation in all societies. To some degree it is a natural expression of group identity and function".

The search for the roots of racial prejudice, sociologically speaking, would begin with the study of the primary unit of society, the child, and how his behavior is molded by the dominant culture in which he lives. "Social scientists are now convinced that children learn social, racial and religious prejudices in the course of observing and being influenced by the existing patterns

1. Allport, G. W. "The Nature of Prejudice" p. 71.
2. Yunger, J. M., "A Minority Group in America", McGrow Hill, New York 1965. pp.

in the culture in which they live". Children hold membership in various groups and from each they learn to make certain values and judgements. They soon learn to distinguish the objects and people who are esteemed by the group, from those who are despised. The most influential group will be the child's immediate family. "In every society on earth the child is regarded as a member of his parents' group. He is ordinarily expected to hold his parents' loyalties and prejudice; and if the parents, because of their group membership, are an object of prejudice, the child is automatically victimized". Or conversely, if membership of the group depends on the parents' prejudice toward minorities, the child will invariably be aware of racial differences. Later on in this essay we shall show that such an awareness takes place as early as three years of age, and even before.

Racial prejudice may then be a reaction of the individual to group pressure. The roots of prejudice would therefore be found in the reason for man's behavior being determined by his group. Sprott provides a reasonable explanation; "The pressure of the group on the individual is in the direction of conformity. The reason for this pressure to conform against which the nonconformist has to fight is due to the need people have for approval". [1] The origin of this need to conform can be explained psychologically, though the final behavior may be a sociological process. Sprott claims that, "Conformity is the results of the fact that in the long periods of human chilhood the child is dependent upon other people for the satisfaction of all his needs. He learns to measure himself according to the goodwill he receives from surrounding adults. No one is so self-satisfied as to do without the approval of at least one other person". "Another factor for conforming", according to Sprott, is "That we may have no other criterion for determining the validity of one's judgements: a consensus of judgements expressed by a group helps us to make up our minds and relieves us of an uncomfortable feeling of doubt and uncertainty". [2] The need to conform to societal pressures may be so strong that in order to be accepted by the dominant group one may develop feelings of prejudice against a minority group although they may not be directed at individual

---

1. Sprott, W. J. H., "Human Groups", Penguin, 1958 p. 14.
2. Sprott, op. cit. p. 16.

members of that group. A 'white' Southerner may hate Negroes as a group but be fond of his Negro 'boy' or 'mammy'. He may also praise certain outstanding Negro musicians, athletes or other Negro acquaintances who, he will claim, are different. Undoubtedly some of the roots of prejudice may be found in the need of some men to conform to societal pressures. And for many social scientists, "... it is highly probable that prejudice based on conformity to social custom of a group is the most common (type) in our society and in others". But surely all men in a society do not wish to conform, and so the roots of prejudice must have sources other than group conformity. Indeed other theories regarding the effects of society in developing racial prejudices among its members have been postulated by social scientists. For example, Clark suggests that middle-class striving and success and status, which characterises all societies whose economies are based on free enterprise, is a determinant of racial prejudice. He writes. "... success in this competitive striving or in other patterned life-ways brings such psychological advantages and rewards that the wonder is not that there are many prejudiced persons but that there are a good many relatively unprejudiced". [1]

Many social scientists would place the primary emphasis, and the fundamental cause of prejudice on social distance, others on the sense of group position. The latter theory, group position, has been discussed in a paper by Blumer. "Race prejudice exists basically in a sense of group position rather than in a set of feelings which members of one racial group have towards another... (it) is fundamentally a matter of relationship between racial groups". [2] Thus, according to Blumer, racial prejudice is the result of one's identification with a particular group. "Racial prejudice presupposes that racially prejudiced individuals think of themselves as belonging to a given group(and) they assign to other racial groups those against whom they are prejudicial". Through a collective process, the prejudiced person forms an image of his group and its members who are seen as racially

---

1. Clark, K. B., "Prejudice and Your Child" Sec. Ed., Beacon Press, Boston (Paper back.) 1963. p. 74.
2. Blumer, H., "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position", Pacific Social Review, 1966. p. 3.

superior. This feeling of superiority places the subordinate group "below' his group. As long as the subordinate group maintain their position, i. e., stay in their place, racial prejudice is not directed towards them, despite the feelings of the individual members within the dominant group. However, when the dominant group feels its social position threatened or challenged by the subordinate one, racial prejudice will result.

The roots of racial prejudice, it seems, follow a remarkably similar path in various societies, whether these are composed of men or animals.

Historical Origin of Prejudice

Sociologists have provided a vast body of evidence which shows that racial prejudice is a product of culural and societal factors. However, modern societies are complex ones and are composed of members of one or more minority groups. At various times and in various places, some form of prejudice has been directed at each of these groups. Yet, prejudice toward Negroes runs higher than towards any other group —at least in North America. In this latter country, the stronger feeling of prejudice toward Negroes, than toward other minorities, is found in children and adults alike.[1] The question here, then, is why has the Negro been singled out from all other minority groups to be the primary target for racial prejudice, especially in the North American society? The answer to this question may be found in the history of minority groups in the Americas. Needless to say such an account will be brief as the full history of minorities is beyond the scope of this essay.

Historical Background

Historically, man has always been a migratory animal. His search for food and wealth, his quest for adventure and his love of war which resulted either in victory or defeat and enslavement by the enemy, have caused him to be dispersed

1. Frenkel-Brunswick, E. "Prejudice in the Interviews of Children: I Attitudes Toward Minority Groups". J. of Genetic Psych. Vol. 82. 1953, p. 135.

throughout the world. Thus, races of men who for centuries evolved organs and traits for survival in a specific area, now find themselves in areas where these traits and organs have little or no survival function. Man's highly evolved brain and (intellect) now makes him physically adaptable for any society. Migration is the process of forging larger societies, which by so doing creates minority groups. Thus in a mobile world where many nations have been forged out of the consolidation of former distinctive groups, minority —majority group situations occur. And, because of some outstanding trait, talent, or circumstance one group emerges as dominant, the other(s) as subordinate or minorities.[1] As we pointed out, majority or minority in this context is not a numerical concept, rather the social position of a given group, and how its members are perceived and treated by others in the same society. The physical traits and talents so necessary for survival in one society, may be the very things which cause a particular race to be outstanding, i.e., alien, and attacked in another. This is the fate of the 'black' man in a 'white' society. His blackness serves not to protect him from natural forces, but to single him out as a readily identifiable target for the prejudiced feeling of the dominant group. Man's reaction to aliens or foreigners is analogous to that of animals. Research has shown that changing an animal's environment or suddenly placing it in another one may change its behavior so that it may be viciously attacked by members of its new environment.

Men first become aware of the physical differences of the alien among their group. They then form some sort of opinion or belief, and later an attitude. And, if certain factors are believed to characterize the alien, the group may either ignore him or develop varying degrees of prejudice towards him. This is the fate of the alien Negro in the white American society. A historical study of the Negro's arrival as an 'alien' may help explain the roots of prejudice.

---

1. Huxley claims that the superior contribution of one race over another is due primarily to the chance factor, that on race contained two instead of one percent of exceptionally gifted men and women (See, Huxley, J. "Essays of a Humanist," Pelican Book, London, 1966. pp. 260 - 264.)

Up from Slavery[1]

The roots of prejudice toward Negroes are intrinsically bound up with his history in the Americas, both North and South. Virtually all Negroes in the Americas are descendants of slaves. To understand the Negro's present social position, we must understand his past history as a slave. For the present image the white man holds of the Negro, and the one many Negroes hold of themselves, may well be a reflection of their inferior status as slaves. "There is a natural prejudice that prompts men to despise whoever has been their inferior long after he has been their equal".[2] But slavery alone cannot account for the white man's contempt of Negroes. For, as we previously pointed out throughout history, virtually all races or ethnic groups have at one time been slaves. However, in ancient times men could move from slavery to freedom without great difficulty because former slaves could not be distinguished from those who had always been free. The Negro, because of his color, transmits the eternal mark of his ignominy to all his descendants. Equally, the white man transmits his feelings about the Negro to his progeny. The stereotype picture of the Negro as lazy, stupid, innately inferior, etc., is taught to and learned by each member of the white society in the process of being socialized. The formula of white over black which we shall see is a universal one, had its origin in the position of master over slave, a position that the white man has continuously struggled to preserve.

Another influential factor in creating and preserving the inferior image of the Negro was the fact that he did not win his freedom in some glorious battle against the white man. He was freed by him! During slavery, the Negro did not break his chains, and psychologically he has remained enchained ever since. For over a century, the Negro in America, from birth to death, has been continuously impressed with his 'innate' inferiority. From the days of slavery, he has been told that he was predestined by the Divine "to be a hewer of wood and a drawer of water", "a servant of servants unto his brethren". A Negro who is continually told he is inferior, stupid and lazy may internalize these attitudes

1. See Rose, A. M. & Rose, C. B. Ed., Minority Problems, Harper & Row, New York, 1965 pp. 3.
2. Silberman, C. Crisis in Black and White, Random House, 1964, p. 78.

toward himself and consequently perceive himself as such. And his behavior will be in accordance with his self perception. This is a vivid illustration of the self-fulfilling prophecy. The Negro's own behavior is used to rationalize and justify the prejudice felt toward him. The roots of prejudice which had their beginning in the period of slavery have continued to grow during the period of freedom.

Society as a whole is greater than the sum of its component parts, i.e., men. But without its parts, it ceases to exist. Society is an abstraction: men are real. Thus, it seems that the roots of prejudice cannot be studied in abstract, (society) rather in the reality of man. In the last analysis it is the individuals who comprize the society who feel the prejudice. For society as such is incapable of feeling. The study of man's behavior falls in the competence of psychology. We must turn to this discipline in order to continue our search for the origin of man's prejudices.

Psychological Origin of Prejudice

Academic, social, clinical and experimental psychologists, psychoanalysts and psychiatrists have contributed greatly to our knowledge of prejudice. The findings of their studies are not always in accord, but each uses as his initial frame of reference MAN, his personality, i.e., what he is; and his behavior, i.e., what he does; and how these influence and are influenced by his environment. All psychologists and psychiatrists realize the importance of culture in determining man's personality and behavior. Some psychologists and psychiatrists would give precedence to the study of the individual, though aware of the influence of societal and cultural factors. Others would give preference to the analysis of MAN'S culture, while others would insist that there is a definite personality type which may exist in any culture and which, by and large is a reflection of some degree of personality deviation or pathology.

Individual Concept of Behavior[1]

The work of Allport is an example of the first approach —the importance of the individual in determining his behavior.

1. See: Allport, G. W. "Pattern & Growth in Personality", Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York, 1961. pp. 167 - 172.

He claims that the abstract culture concept seems remote and even misleading. No individual is a mirror image of the model or average culture patterns. Culture shapes personality chiefly because it provides ready made pre-tested solutions to many of life's problems. Culture has an answer to every question that can be asked, though the answer may be —We don't know! In terms of real culture, what seems to happen is that the individual, according to his temperament and evolving sense of self, selects from the 'tolerable range' allowed by his culture, the pictures that fit best his own style of life. He may find that almost every feature suits him, if so, he becomes a full-conformist. Many people, however, deviate in practice and thought from cultural models and conform only within necessary limits. Hence we find at one extreme the true conformist and at the other the rebel and total misfit. Most individuals lie somewhere between these two extremes. The prejudiced individual, the conformist, would typify one extreme; the unprejudiced or liberal, the other. Both, however, may reside in the same culture as is seen in the case of liberal 'whites' in North America and South Africa.

The individual need not absorb every aspect of his culture into his personality system. How this may take place has been described in the so-called 'onion-layer' conception of personality structure, whose chief exponent is Lewin.[1] According to Lewin concept of personality, the person is a differentiated region separated by a permeable boundary from his external environment. Although his perceptual-motor systems are in direct contact with his environment, these are fluid and adaptable and do no reflect the more permanent dispositions of personality. Various cultural habits are found among the peripheral systems but these may proceed without a sense of self-involvement, conflict or strain.

The liberal person may be quite aware of racial differences and racial prejudices in his environment. He may sense the importance of these in his culture. But, the opinions held against Negroes by the dominant group have not become incorporated into the heart or innermost region of his personality wherein lies the true self.

Racial prejudice is seen by some psychologists as a natural phenomenon found in all men. Like other aspects of the personality,

1. See Lewin, K. "Dynamic Theory of Personality", New York. McGraw Hill, 1935.

racial prejudice, they feel, merely reflects man's basic needs and motives. These needs differ in intensity, quality and method of satisfaction among individuals. They are found in normal and apparently stable individuals as well as in neurotic ones. If this is true, racial prejudice is not an exclusive trait of the neurotics, or maladjusted individual.

Behaviorist Theory

The Behaviorist school of psychology has posited an interesting explanation of racial prejudice. It holds that an unpleasant experience with members of an ethnic group results in a negative conditioning. Therefore, prejudice is an overt manifestation of a negative conditioning process. Continued bad experiences would reinforce prejudice, good experiences would reduce it. However, a white person may be strongly prejudiced against Negroes without ever having an experience with them, either bad or good.

Neo-Behaviorist Theory

The contemporary Neo-behaviorist school has couched its theory of racial prejudice in terms of a frustration-aggression process. This is similar to the Freudian theory of displacement and projection. That is, a group of people (or a person) becomes frustrated because of various reasons (economic conditions, failure in some enterprise, etc.) which leads to aggression. When a group of people, a society or an entire country feels frustrated, its substitute for the object of aggression must be something widely available and yet weak. Accordingly, the Negro in North America serves this function and becomes the object for the feelings of frustration felt by the whole white nation.

Psychologists generally agree that aggression is one of the two primary basic instincts (motives) of man (the other is love). But, as we pointed out, man's aggression is more than a response to frustration. Prejudice, especially when overtly expressed may certainly contain an aggressive component. But there is no evidence that all prejudiced people are frustrated. And aggression properly channelized may be a positive reaction in man, essential for the growth and development of his personality. "Man's aggression is an attempt to assert himself as an individual, to

separate himself from the herd, to find his own identity".[1] Viewed in this light the truly aggressive person would be one who is rebellious toward his environment, non-conformist, and not readily accepting the opinions and beliefs of the dominant culture. Bernard Berensen once wrote that creation and aggression march hand in hand. "Genius is the capacity for productive reaction against one's training". If this is true, a prejudiced man could hardly become a genius. And, indeed most creative persons are remarkably free-thinkers and non-conformists. They are rarely if ever racially prejudiced!

General Psychological Theory of Prejudiced Personality

General psychological theories of prejudice have been set out in the classic work of Allport entitled, "The Nature of Prejudice",[2] in which the author defines the terms, prejudice, segregation and discrimination, the dynamics of prejudice, and offers a psychological analysis of the prejudiced personality. The latter, he describes as "a person with unresolved infantile conflicts with parents or siblings, a persistent failure, or one whose ego has failed to integrate the myriad of environmental pressures without". A prejudiced person, according to Allport, is an insecure one, who requires stability and manufactures it when it does not objectively exist. He has a low tolerance for ambiguity, he needs a firm simple categorical memory, he clings (perseverates), loves order and fails to perceive all the relevant sides of a problem. Hence, he is narrow-minded. This attitude may be due to his having suffered much deprivation when a child. However all deprived children are not per se prejudiced.

A prejudiced person will tend to be intensely patriotic, a bigot or superpatriot. This excessive love for his country leads him to suspect and fear the alien intruder who threatens the safe conception of what 'nation' means. As we pointed out, Negroes are conspicuously foreign, transgressors in a white society. (The anti-American in Britain or the anti-Yankee in Latin America perceives the North American as one who is threatening to destroy all that he loves and cherishes as being traditionally good in his country). Therefore, 'hate' prejudice is actually based

1. Storr, A., "Integrity of the Personality". Penguin, London, 1963.
2. Allport, G. W. "The Nature of Prejudice", Addison-Wesley, New York, 1954.

on love, a love and respect for that which is one's own, a fear and distrust of that which threatens to remove or change it.

The style of thinking that is characteristic of prejudice is believed to be a reflection, by and large, of the prejudiced person's way of thinking about anything. If so, a person who is anti-Negro would tend to be anti-any minority group. This point will be discussed in detail elsewhere in this essay.

A tolerant person's highest value would be esthetic, and his lowest political and economic. On the other hand, prejudice people seem to place a greater value on politics and economics as these symbolize power and security. Prejudiced persons are extropunitive in that they blame outside agencies (or people) for their failures and project their hatred on person or groups different from their own. They also tend to be strict about cleanliness, adhere to conventional virtues, and are intolerant toward norm-violators, especially the violation of sexual standards. The prejudiced person therefore projects on the Negro certain anti-social or unethical qualities, (e.g. being over-sexed) which are perceived as being sinful. He may be unconsciously overconcerned with sex in others, and therefore condems as immoral any person or thing that arouses his sexual feelings. The Negro seems dark, mysterious and distant, yet warm, human and accessible (loveable). (The dark lover is a universal figure in fiction and sun-bathing supposedly enhances sex appeal: however, villians are usually dark). A desire for a Negro may be repressed and projected on the Negro who is blamed for having sexually aggressive desires toward one. "Inadequate, semi-impotent or latent homosexual men tend to be more antagonistic toward minorities".[1] That sexuality influences racial prejudice and stimulates violence has been clearly shown in the lynchings of Negroes in the south of the United States for merely looking at a white woman.

Psychologically, prejudice is thus seen as the individual's acting out his unconscious motives and needs, his feelings of insecurity, frustration, anger, hate and aggression, and his feelings of guilt, anxiety, envy and sexual inadequacy. These are supposedly the dynamics of prejudice, and many psychologists would claim that it is these wherein lie the roots of racial prejudice.

---

1. Allport, op. cit. p. 377.

Social Psychological or "Scape-Goat Theory"

Most social psychologists, however, do not share this view, and like the sociologists, would seek out the roots of prejudice in man's culture rather than in his unconscious. Racial prejudice is therefore a reflection of a nation's culture, its system of values.Clark affirms this view when he states, "The total pattern of striving for status and success which characterizes North American middle-class life provides the context in which one should seek the origin and nature of racial prejudice".[1] This theory of prejudice is usually referred to as the 'scape-goat' theory, and is one that is used by psychologists, psychoanalysts and sociologists alike to explain at least, in part, the prejudice held against minorities. Stated succinctly, a person either achieves success and thereby self-esteen and assurance, or he fails and seeks a scape-goat. "In a society that provides convenient and socially approved groups as scapegoats, many members of that society uncritically direct their hostility toward these group: [2] (op. cit. p. 34).

Furthermore, the value of possession of property and the fear of its devaluation because of the presence of Negroes is another cause of prejudice. There is undoubtedly a large group of social scientists who are convinced that children learn racial prejudice in the course of observing or being influenced by the existence of patterns in the culture in which they live.

Psychoanalytical Theory

From a psychoanalytic point of view —an approach which assumes unconscious mental operations— aggression and sexuality stand out as the primary dynamic factors of prejudice. Repressed aggressive tendencies and sexual desires are also the etiology of neuroses. Accordingly, a prejudiced man is a neurotic one, or at least one who manifests frank neurotic or even psychotic tendencies. The outstanding psychiatrist, Dr. David Stafford-Clark, expresses this view forcefully, "There

1. Clark, K. B., "Prejudice and Your Child" See. Ed., Beacon Press, Boston (Paper Back Ed.) 1963.
2. Clark, op. cit. p. 34.

is a striking resemblance between embraced prejudice and insane delusion; between persecution and psychotic behavior; between the method of apartheid and the madness of paranoia".[1] "Prejudice and certain kinds of psychosis have this in common, that they are rigid against rational assault (and) they ignore arguments and refutations however sound and convincing as though these did not exist". Dr. Stafford Clark further states, "Prejudice inevitably becomes to the prejudiced what alcohol becomes to the alcoholic — not a problem but a solution. In this sense prejudice is a drug of addiction, and like every other object of addiction it becomes indispensable to the addicted subject".[2] Without expression of his prejudiced feelings, the prejudiced person becomes unbearably distressed and diminished.

Psychoanalysts offer various explanations of the causes of prejudice: (1) that they result from the continuation of infantile patterns of repressed resentment and hostility toward a younger brother or sister, or buried feelings of hatred toward parents; (2) that they are the result of strict, rigid, punitive, highly moralistic parents; (3) that they are the manifestion of realistic and irrational thinking which reflects deep frustration and repressed hostility; (4) that they reflect tendencies of human beings to protect their own self-esteem by ascribing to others (projection) the negative characteristics that might apply to themselves, and; (5) that they are the fullest expression of the frustration-aggression theory. Anyone who has read or witnessed the scenes of racial violence in North America, the brutal attacks against Negroes, men, women, and children alike; the atrocities committed in the concentration camps of Belsen and Auchwitz, etc. would agree that those who participate in such hideous acts indeed must be 'mad'.

The Theory of Authoritorian Personality[3]

There seems to be a 'hard-core' group in certain societies by word or deed is dedicated to the complete humiliation or annihilation of a particular minority group. If it could be shown

1. Stafford-Clark, D., "The Psychology of Persecution and Prejudice, The Council of Christian & Jews, London, 1966. p. 15.
2. Stafford-Clark, op. cit. p. 16.
3. Adorno, T. W., et al., "The Authoritarian Personality", Science Ed., 1964. (Paper Back Ed.)

that such persons share a similar pattern of dynamic factors which differ from those of non-prejudiced individuals, the potentially prejudiced adult would be identified, possibly in early childhood. In this manner, some steps could be taken to mitigate his negative feelings toward race, and prevent the emergence of a full-blown race bigot. Scientific attempts in this direction have been carried out, the most prominant of these being the work done by Adorno and his colleagues. His findings are set out in the volume, "The Authoritarian Personality". The author(s) was motivated by the mass genocide of the Jews by the Nazis in Germany. His approach was psychological with a psychoanalytical orientation. That is, it is based on Freudian psychology, but using the tools of academic psychology. The psychological approach is used because the aim of the authors was not merely to describe prejudice but to explain it in order to help in its eradication. Eradication means re-education, scientifically planned on the basis of understanding scientifically arrived at. And education in a strict sense is by its nature personal and psychological. Therefore "...to expose the psychological tricks in the arsenal of the agitator may help to immunize his prospective victims against them". The book suggests that there is a close relation between a number of deep-rooted personality traits and overt prejudice. The authors have succeeded in producing an instrument for measuring these traits among various strata of the North American population. These traits, when found in a cluster seem to identify a specific personality-type which Adorno and his workers have termed "the Authoritarian Personality". Such a personality-type would have strong feelings of racial prejudice. However, Adorno et al, prefer to use the term, 'ethnocentric'. The term prejudice, he feels, is not entirely adequate as it has numerous meanings and connotations. On the other hand, he adds, ethnocentrism is a tendency in an individual to be ethnically centered, to be rigid in his acceptance of the culturally 'alike' and repel the 'unalike' [1] (ibid.p.102). An ethnic group is defined as being, people who share a common culture, system of social ways, institutions, traditions, language, and so forth. An ethnic group is not a nation which is a political-geographical entity, and it (an ethnic group) may be composed of several races. For example, Latins who may be Negro, White or Indian, compose an ethnic group. The rationale for attempting to identify a

---

1. Adorno, op. cit. p. 102.

specific personality type is based on the authors' (Adorno et al) own concept of personality. They perceive personality as an organization of forces or needs within the individual. These persisting forces of personality help to determine responses in various situations and it is thus largely to them that consistency of behavior, whether verbal or physical, is attributable. The authors point out that behavior is not personality, rather personality lies behind behavior and within the individual. The forces of personality are primary, our needs (drives, wishes, emotional impulses, etc.). Man also has other needs such as those to avoid punishment, to keep the good-will of the social group and a need to maintain harmony and integration within the self. Thus, logically it is held that opinions, attitudes and values depend upon human needs and since personality is essentially an organization of needs, the personality may be regarded as a determinant of ideological preferences. The political, economic and social convictions of an individual often form a broad and coherent pattern, as if bound together by a 'mentality' or 'spirit' and that this pattern is an expression of deep-lying trends in an individual's personality. This personality structure may be such as to render the individual susceptible to anti-democratic behavior. Evidence from this study, according to its authors, "confirms what has often been indicated: that a man who is hostile toward one minority group is very likely to be hostile against a wide variety of others".[1] "Anti-semitism or anti-negroism are not isolated attitudes but parts of a relatively unified ethnocentric ideology". After testing over 2,000 Americans, ages 20-35, Adorno and his colleagues devised a scale (Fascist or F Scale) which they claim might be used for measuring prejudice among minority group members themselves and most important, it might provide a more valid measure of prejudice and yield a valid estimate of antidemocratic tendencies at the personality level. Those who score high would be extremely ethnocentric, and hence would have an 'Authoritarian Personality'.

This study is one of the few which has used an objective approach to uncover the roots of prejudice which the authors are convinced lie deep in man's ego-structure and not in his culture.

---

1. Adorno, op. cit. p. 9.
2. Ibid. p. 207.
3. Ibid. pp. 222-223.

They do admit, however, that for a prejudiced person to 'survive' there must exist already alive in the majority of the population some anti-democratic potential.

Prima facie, the instrument which has emerged as a result of this comprehensive study by Adorno and his colleagues would seem to provide a valid and objective tool for identifying the potentially racially prejudiced individuals in a society within whose ego-structure (the heart of the personality) we would find the roots of racial prejudice. If this proved to be true, once such character traits had been identified, some measures could be taken to prevent these roots from feeding on the cultural soil and branching out and flowering into racial hatred and violence. Alas, this objective approach has also been criticized and the belief of an exclusive universal personality type (Authoritarian) predisposed to prejudice against any one or all minority groups, has not been accepted by many outstanding social scientists. Nevertheless, the work of Adorno et al has stimulated much thought and action in this area. Allport, for example, commenting on the many studies using the F Scale, regrets the "Unfortunate error made in composing the original scale, i.e., the items are unidirectional; an agreement is always scored as authoritarian".[1] This fact has led some critics to claim that there is no elaborate authoritarian syndrome involved but merely a tendency to acquiesce... a simple form of suggestibility... The scale still correlates with ethnic prejudice, but the original elaborate theory of an authoritarian 'character structure' is placed under strain.

The essential contribution of Adorno's and similar researches, it seems, has been the definition of a personality type which appears to correlate highly with ethnocentrism. For there is some evidence that the ethnocentric personality will have strong anti-democratic tendencies. Adorno's findings are limited in that they are based on adult responses. It would seem preferable to study behavioral patterns of children rather than (or as well as) adults if we want to discover the true beginnings of racial prejudice. Such an approach has been described in the work of the social psychologist Kenneth B. Clark, an American Negro

---

1. Allport, G. W. "The Nature of Prejudice" p. 437.

and a social anthropologist, Mary E. Goodman.[1] A complete review of the latter book is included in the appendix.

Racial Awareness in Children

The above mentioned two books place us closer to the roots of prejudice and their results make questionable many of the time worn opinions and myths about racial prejudice held by even the educated stratum of our society. For example, it has long been held that children do not recognize racial differences unless these are taught them by parents; that working-class, uneducated persons are more prejudiced than intelligent educated ones; that schools and teachers have a direct influence on the development of racial attitudes in children, hence, through education racial prejudice can be eliminated; that the more religious the person the less prejudiced he will be; and, that prejudice is a unitary factor having a specific causal agent, and so on.

Both Clark[2] and Goodman, using psychological techniques, (the presentation of multi-racial dolls to white and Negro children) found similar results: that racial awareness in children —black and white— begins as early as three years of age regardless of whether parents are or are not overtly racially prejudiced, Parents are merely one element of the complex pattern of social forces that influences the child's racial, religious and social attitudes. A white child's behavior towards Negroes will be influenced not only by the attitude of his parents and siblings but by the type of community in which he lives, his classmates, friends, neighbors, his school, his church, and the mass media used for communicating and perpetuating the stereotype image of the Negro. School teachers and other adults, of course, have some influence, but their role is a passive one, since children are more influenced by peer-group opinions than by those of adults (authority). The church also plays a minor role in determining positive racial attitudes. Though all churches preach love and brotherhood of man, it is a paradox that the more religious the individual, the more he attends and participates actively in church, the more

---

1. Goodman, M. E., "Racial Awareness in Young Children", Revised Edition, Colliers Books, 1964.
2. Clark, H. B. "Prejudice and Your Child", Second Ed., Beacon Press, Boston (Paper Back) 1963.

prejudiced he is apt to be. This is in keeping with the findings of Adorno et al, who state: "A person who accepts and practices his parent's religion is more apt to show such traits as conformity, conventionalism, authoritarianism, submission, determination by external pressures... in short a potentially racially prejudiced individual".[1]

Some people sincerely believe that it is the "poor white", "red-neck", "white trash" of North America who are prejudiced and that the middle or upper class educated North American is more liberal in his views about race. These studies show that the middle, upper-middle and educated classes are equally or more prejudiced as seen in social snobbery and discrimination. It is the upper classes who wish to maintain their superior position and prejudice satisfies (inflates) the ego of the mediocre members of these societies. And, education as it is presently given in North American schools and colleges has little, if any, influence in determining positive racial attitudes, especially in certain rigid personality type. The racial violence, hatred and opposition observed in 'educated' men, on attempting to integrate or desegregate schools and colleges in North America, is a vivid testimony of the declaration — "education per se is not enough". Both Clark and Goodman found that all North American children — white or Negro— have a preference for white skin color. They also tend to associate, at an early age, blackness with dirtiness, ugliness and something frightening. Conversely, white represents that which is pure, clean, good and beautiful. Negro children invariably ask, "Why am I black?" No white child, however, demands to know why he is white. "Black" therefore contains a strong emotional element, which stirs up feelings of anxiety, fear and guilt amongst children. And those who wear this color are the recipients of these charged emotions. To be black is therefore interpreted as being inferior and the formula white over black is recognized by all Americans. In fact, it is seen throughout the world.[2] In every society the lighter members perceive themselves as superior to the darker ones. The roots of prejudice

1. See "The Authoritarian Personality" p. 226.
2. This formula is possibly changing in the New African Nations whose citizens wear their blackness with pride and dignity. And, due to the Black Power movement it is rapidly changing among some Black communities in North America.

thus emerge from the very conception of 'black' itself. And the awareness of this conception of blackness is found at a very early age. Racial awareness is not synonymous with racial prejudice, it is however the seed from which prejudices grow, and from this seed —the awareness of racial differences— may well spring forth the roots of racial prejudice.

Conclusion

The roots of prejudice run deeply and extensively within and without man's very being. They spread in a variety of elusive pathways, intertwining in a complex almost contradictory pattern. Their presence is a universal indefinable phenomenon. For what are we to make of the results of all these studies, each carried out by an eminent authority, yet at times the conclusiones of one seem to be diammetrically opposed to those of another? For example, we have seen that some authorities still insist that the prejudiced person is maladjusted, and neurotic or psychotic, while others with equal authority claim that the prejudiced person is quite stable, the conformist, the one who has learned and accepted without question the norms, mores and values of the dominant society. The non-prejudiced (liberal) they claim is the rebel, the non-conformist, the one who has more open anxieties, more conflicts and more directly faced insecutiries. On one hand, we are told that the roots of prejudice are found in man's culture, on the other we learn that they are embedded in the unconscious layers of his ego-structure, cultural factors playing only a minor role.

However, on the basis of the evidence gathered from these studies we can offer part answers to our initial queries. Such answers, undoubtedly will have a personal bias. For prejudice in the main, is a very personal 'thing', though not a 'thing' which a person either has or does not have, but rather it is a continuum which begins with an awareness of racial difference and terminates in racial hatred and violence. Intermediary stages along this continuum would include quantitative differences of love-hate feelings. A person who dislikes another because of racial differences has made the first step towards prejudice —he has made a pre-judgement based more on feeling than on fact. If his feelings persist despite the presentation of rational evidence contrary to his beliefs, he may justifiably be called prejudiced.

Thus, prejudice is not a fixed concept, rather a set of attitudes (or beliefs) often conflicting among themselves which are evoked in various combinations by different situations. Prejudice toward Negroes as a group may not be consistent with the feeling toward and treatment of some of the individual members of that group. (A white man may hate Negroes and yet have an intimate relationship with a Negress, or have Negro friends and acquaintances). Attitudes of 'whites' towards Negroes are remarkably inconsistent and the feeling of prejudice would depend very much on the circumstances in which the two races meet. In North America, racial feelings would be high; in Latin America, low. "Ambiguity and inconsistencies are characteristics found in all men, and ambivalent feelings are a universal psychological construct. We do mingle love and hate, and we vary our response according to our external experiences and internal feelings as these are evoked".

Prejudice, like other forms of man's behavior is the product of many related factors. It reflects basic biological and psychological needs which differ in intensity, quality and method of satisfaction and expression. These basic needs are universal, spring from within the personality, and react readily to environmental stimuli. The intensity of these needs, the factor of whether they can be satisfied in a socially approved manner and the anxiety and guilt associated with the method of satisfying them, might be the basis for distinguishing the neurotic from the normal and the prejudiced personality from the un-prejudiced one. Prejudice, however, transcends skin-color, social position or education... And it cannot be over-emphasized that Negroes are prejudiced against whites and other minority groups, viz., Puerto Ricans. Indeed, Negroes are often prejudiced against other Negroes.[1]

The underlying quality of all prejudice is insecurity. The expression it takes, however, will depend on the presence of and the relationship with a minority group in a given society, along with the acceptance of prejudice toward this group by the dominant society. A person who is anti a particular group is motivated by

---

1. There exists a definite hierarchy among American Negroes based on skin color, the high yellows feeling superior to the "Jet-Blacks." Recently, with the advent of Black Power this status has been reversed.

some degree of feeling of insecurity. The group on which he projects these feelings may well depend on the presence of this group and its status in society. For example, to be anti-American in Britain or Latin America today is most acceptable, however to express openly anti-semitic feeling would meet with disdain. A person may be passively prejudiced limiting his feeling to an occasional remark, or he may be highly active. Among the former —the passive— are found leaders of society, educators, college professors and teachers, clerics, ministers, priests, rabbis and others; among the latter --the highly active— the racist, rabble-rousers, bigots, and rioters. The politician, it seems, falls, between the two worlds. The first group (the passive) tend to be more emotionally stable; and the latter more neurotic. But both groups may be equally as prejudiced. And, it is not certain whether intense verbal prejudices are necessarily associated with such intense negative racial behavior as incitement to violence.

The child who is aware of racial differences and then verbalizes these differences, may merely be stating an observed truth. When he says, "Johnny is black", it may be that Johnny is 'black'. When such observations are emotionally loaded, and expressed in epithets, the child is well on his way to acquiring prejudiced feelings.

Recommendations

There is no one solution to the problem of racial prejudice, and some authorities would not even attempt its eradication. A completely unprejudiced society does not imply a classless one, or one in which all men would be expected to live in complete harmony, rather that the dominant class will not be characterized by members of one particular race or ethnic group. All strata will be open to those who are desirous and capable of entering. Prejudice has its positive side. A man without prejudices, according to Parks is, "A man without convictions and ultimately without character".[1] The elimination of racial prejudices will not eliminate all prejudice. It will eliminate that form of prejudice which prevents human and societal growth.

---

1. See Parks, R. E., "Race and Culture". The Free Press, London, 1950. p. 230.

How racial prejudice can be eliminated is beyond the scope of this essay. However, some part solutions, both general and specific are included for consideration. Needless to say any plan of elimination of racial prejudice must begin with children.

Generally, all children must be shown that racial prejudice inhibits personal growth and social progress. Children exposed to racial prejudice must be led to strive to build their self-esteem by solid and realistic personal achievements. Negro children will need special assurance that their parents love and accept them, so that they never need to apologize or feel ashamed of their color. However, as Clark states, "A Negro child should never be permitted to use minority status as an excuse for inferior achievement or for undesirable personal characteristics".[1] To help bolster his self-esteem, the Negro child should be impressed with the achievements of Negroes in past and present history. The stereotyped image of the Negro as an inferior should be prevented from being perpetuated through mass media of communication, such as films, TV, radio and even books. By use of these same media a more positive image could be projected. The family, school, church and civic organizations and community agencies should coordinate their efforts. But these alone will not accomplish the task. Two specific solutions are suggested: (1) legal, (2) inter-racial marriage.

The importance of legislative action has been clearly set out in the statement published in the British journal, New Society. "Although the public expression of racial prejudice is not socially acceptable, and may indeed be criminal, racial prejudice as a private state of mind, and its private expression, are so wide-spread as to be normal. It is mistaken to assume that such prejudice will not in the future seek expression in acts of discrimination against racial minorities".[2]

"There is further reason for wanting legislation and an independent public body to enforce it. The task is not to change the existing majority patterns of racial prejudice, as a state of mind —that may or may not happen: it is to ensure that even if

1. Clark, K. B. "Prejudice and Your Child" p. 119.
2. New Society, London, 1966.

prejudice persists it will not result in the emergence of patterns of discrimination, of conventions of exclusion on the grounds of race and color. Every formative influence should, so far as possible, be enlisted: religion, education in schools and parental influence —and one of the greatest formative influences in this society is the law".[1] (6.p.385).

The case for interracial marriage is contained in the statement by the eminent British psychiatrist, Dr. Stafford-Clark, "It is my own sincere and personal belief that the future of the race is constantly to intermingle and in this at least I am consistent. Intermarriage between all human races is biologically and spiritually not only defensible but right. Hybridization at a biological level enriches natural diversity and tends to produce a more versatile genetic structure".[2] (p. 23).

It is succinctly expressed by the North American psychologist Allport, "Intermarriage would symbolize the abolition of prejudice". It is a living reality in all Latin American countries.*

Thus sex which provides the roots of prejudice may through interracial and interethnic marriage also provide its elimination.

January, 1969
University of Puerto Rico
Río Piedras, Puerto Rico

---

1. Op. cit. p. 385.
2. Stafford-Clark, "The Psychology of Persecution and Prejudice". p. 23.

* It is not implied here that Latin America (or any country) is free of racial prejudice. This is far from true what is suggested is that if North Americans could ever achieve the state of race relationship that exists in Latin America, they might well claimed that they have solved in part the racial problem in their country.

References

Adorno, T. W. et al, "The Authoritarian Personality", Science Edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1964.

Allport, G. W., "The Nature of Prejudice", Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1954.

Allport, G. W., "Pattern and Growth in Personality", Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York, 1961.

Blumer, H., "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position," The Pacific Sociological Review, Los Angeles, 1966.

Clark, K. B., "Prejudice and Your Child", Second Edition, Beacon Press, Boston (Paperback), 1963.

Goodman, M. E., "Racial Awareness in Young Children", Revised Edition, Colliers Books, New York, 1964.

Huxley, J., "Essays of a Humanist", Pelican, London, 1964.

Kardiner, A., and Oversey, L., "The Mark of Oppression", The World Publishing Co., Cleveland, 1962.

Klineberg, O., "Race Differences," Harper & Brothers Publ., New York, 1935.

Lorenz, K., "On Aggression", Methuen & Co., Ltd., London, 1966.

Parks, R.E., "Race and Culture", The Free Press, Glencoe, 1950.

Rose, A. M. and Rose, C.B., Editors, "Minority Problems", Harper & Row, New York, 1965.

Silberman, C., "Crisis in Black and White", Random House, New York, 1964, 70-73.

Stafford-Clark, D., "The Psychology of Persecution and Prejudice". The Council of Christian and Jew, London, 1966.

Sprott, W.J.H., "Human Groups", Penguin, 1958.

Yunger, J.M., "A Minority Group in America", McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965.

REFLECTIONS ON THE BOOK "RACIAL AWARENESS IN YOUNG CHILDREN"*

Prologue

When do children first become aware of racial differences? Does this awareness inevitably lead to racial prejudice? When a child calls another one "Black", is he merely stating descriptive fact, or is this an emotionally loaded epithet, a sign of his racial prejudice, learned perhaps from his very parents? At what age are children aware of racial differences? These questions have arisen in classroom discussion in which real-life incidences were vividly recounted by students of education and psychology at the University of Puerto Rico.

These incidences had led the affected persons to believe that, contrary to general opinion, racial prejudice is strong in Puerto Rico even among the educated middle class, including university professors and their children.

Only a few studies have been carried out which might throw light on these questions: to my knowledge none in Puerto Rico. One of the pioneer studies in this area is the one reported and analyzed in detail in this paper. Though carried out in the USA over 20 years ago, its results, I feel, if valid at that time are still so now with few exceptions. And many of the author's conclusions might well be applicable to present-day Puerto Rico.

Introduction

The book —Racial Awareness in Young Children— reports, in non-technical language, a study which was begun in 1943 and concluded in 1948. It is considered "a model of systematic and objective research". Research in the genesis and nature of racial attitudes has been greatly influenced by the works of such outstanding social scientists as Otto Klineberg, Allport and Adorno. These workers were largely concerned with the over-all problem

---

* Racial Awareness in Young Children, Revised Edition, Mary E. Goodman, Colliers Books, New York, 1964.

of racial prejudice, and their result were usually based on studies of an adult population. More recently, psychologists and sociologists have directed their studies towards an analysis of the effects of race prejudice on the members of a particular group, community, society or nation.

The present book may be viewed as an important bridge between those studies which were primarily seeking an understanding of the development of racial prejudice, and those which were concerned with the personality concomitant of racial prejudice. The author's (Dr. Goodman) focus, though ostensibly eclectic, is basically that of the cultural anthropologist. Hence, "...in the anthropological frame of reference, race attitudes are seen as patterned elements in American culture". Through a series of intensive case studies, Dr. Goodman investigates the complex process underlying intergenerational persistence of the culturally predominant pattern of "White" over "Black". This research is an example of "pure" rather than applied research, in that the author seeks to study the problem in social relations primarily because the problem exists, and not because the findings will offer an immediate, or practical solution. Nevertheless, throughout her book she implies or suggests ways of influencing public opinion and attitude about race. This she does without sermonizing.

The study, on which this book is based, was carried out by Dr. Goodman and her two assistants in the Northeastern part of the USA, in a town fictitiously called New Dublin, population 750,000. In the Dover-Harding section of this town there live 160,000 of "The Lord's children" jammed into an area of less than two square miles. Thus, this area is two to three and one-half times more crowded than the city as a whole. This is an area which modern sociologists call a "transitional zone". An old section of an old city, an area where once were fashionable homes which now house low-middle and working-class families. These are closely packed in tenement houses and government housing projects. However, the social extremes of the population are represented here. On one extreme we find the professionals —doctors, lawyers, teachers, ministers and small business men— all of whom stay in the area to be near their clients. At the opposite end we see, the "floaters", the unemployed, old, ill or alcoholic, and those persons living on public assistance.

In the Dover-Harding area reside both Negroes and whites. The latter are descendants from Syrian, Italian, Russian, Latvian, Portuguese, Puerto Rican (some of these are also considered Negroes), and Anglo-Saxon-English, Scots and Irish parentage. These "Whites"tend to form sub-groups according to the ethnic or language background of the immigrant parent. Although these white "immigrants" live in this area, Dover-Harding is known as the "Negro Section" of New Dublin since the whites constitute a small minority, about 10% percent, of the population.

Sample

At least, 103 children's records provide the findings on which this study is based. Of these, 57 are "Negroes", at least, according to the American social definition of "Negro". In actual fact these "Negroes" run the gamut from ebony black to blonds. The 46 "Whites" are almost as varied in skin color and hair type. Thus some of the Negroes are whiter than some Whites and viceversa. Their ages are from 3 years-7 months to 5 years-3months, and they attend one of the four nursery schools in the area. All the children studied have, since birth, some contact with members of both races. Their parents, some of whom have education beyond high school, because of their forced proximity, are in continuous if not friendly contact. "Race relations in this area are now and then genuinely friendly, sometimes openly antagonistic, and quite often largely indifferent". Total disinterest in race, however, is exceedingly rare, especially amongst the Negroes. For a feeling of racial indifference is virtually impossible for people "who have worn a brown skin all their lives". The Northern Negroes, who have resided for some time in the area, have feelings of resignation, acceptance and passivity, while in those recently migrated from the south "the habit of overt deference towards "Whites" tends to survive usually masking degrees of hostility, bitterness, and fear".

In addition to the racial distinction of "White" and "Black", there is much in-group labeling. Amongst the whites, there are the Irish or "Micks"; the Italians or "Wops" or "Dagoes"; while the Negroes are "colored", "The Blacks", "Niggers" and so on.[1]

---

1. Today, many Negroes prefer to be called Afro-Americans.

However, finer differentiations among Negroes, are made. Those who are of West Indian, Puerto Rican or Portuguese ancestry hold a "higher status". Or at least they perceive themselves as superior to "plain American Negroes" possibly, because of their "foreign background". The West Indian is "British" or "English". He seems to have more formal ways, a firmer hand with his children and a church of England affiliation. The Puerto Ricans are Latins or "Spanish". Their ancestry is divided between African, Spanish and Indian. It was only until they came to the US that they realized the full meaning of the word "prejudice".

I was not sure if the five Portuguese families were from Portugal or Brazil. In any event, the darker ones in this study are referred to as Negroes and, like the Puerto Ricans, they feel "a cut above the American Negro". They both flaunt their command of a foreign language, their foreign cookery and their exotic music.

Many of the American Negro families are also racial mixtures which is shown in their cafe-au-lait skin coloring and soft wavy hair, hazel eyes, narrowed lips and sharp noses. (Found in about 3/4 of the sample). There are also children from Negro-White marriages (four families). Regardless of pigmentation, hair texture or physiognomy, they are all perceived as Negroes and are all equally exposed to such epithets as "Dirty", "Filthy" "Black" and "Niggers". And they are treated as such by many of the white families in the community.

Yet, despite their attitudes, the people of New Dublin, by and large, voice the irreconcilable platitudes of the American people, who constantly claim to the world, "We're all Americans". "America is the land of opportunity and equality". "Whatever we are, whatever class, nationality or race, still, we're all the Lord's children".

A complete description of methodology, and data-gathering is given. The author also points out the limitations of the study. "The study does not lend itself to refined statistical application". Therefore, in the author's own words, "findings cannot be applied to populations different than the one studied". She is also aware of the smallness of the sample which probably is not a representative one.

Chapter I — "The Lord's Children"

The writer begins her book with a vivid description of the area in which the children studied reside. Most of these live in "projects" (public housing) which are "attractive, substantial, multifamily brick buildings, nicely spaced around landscaped yards and playgrounds". "They have eliminated many social problems, and in doing so have created new ones". "For, those who reside in the 'project' often complain of loneliness and lack of community spirit. They do not sense a feeling of really belonging". Students of the modern urban scene, in which more and larger "projects" are being built daily to house the culturally deprived, now recognize that such projects create peculiar problems in respect to the individual's sense of belonging, of having a defined and useful place in the world and of being valued as a person by others in his society. And, as Anthony Storr wrote "To feel completely alone and isolated leads to mental disintegration just as physical starvation leads to physical disintegration. "Schizophrenics", according to Fromm, "are probably the most isolated people in the world".

These "projects", though open to all citizens, eventually become havens for Negroes who are subjected to a new form of racial segregation of which they cannot protest on any ground. They are cut off from the main stream of North American life. There is no evidence to show that building more projects reduces feelings of segregation either in those who reside in them, or in the people in the areas in which they are located.

Chapter II — What Am I?

This chapter takes as its frame of reference, Gesell's study on "The First Five Years of Life". It offers a schematic account of the development of four year old children. This is interspersed with Dr. Goodman's own comments gleaned from interviews with the children and their families. For example, one Negro child when asking her father, "What am I"? received in a humorous tone the answer, "You are a tantalizin' brown. So's your ma and so am I". The child was about three years old, at the time. She turned and asked the same question to her mother who replied: "You are an American, and so am I, and so's your father". At

nursery school, the same child asked her teacher: "What are you"?, to which she replied. "I am an American". The child then proudly acclaimed, "I'm an American, too". The same child prefered a white playmate to a colored one. The white playmate, in turn, showed preference for a white companion. She stated as a reason for her preference: "He's white and you're colored". To which the Negro girl retorted "Oh, no, I'm a tantalizin' brown"!

One cannot help but wonder how this child would have met this situation if she had really been very dark, as indeed many Negroes are. The author never raises this question. It seems safe and satisfactory to tell the Negro child, when called "Black", to emphasize his brownness, a color more sociably acceptable than black. But the word "black" I feel when used as an epithet, hardly refers to color, rather to a concept in which are incorporated all the negative emotional feelings that the word "black" conveys. This point was brought out in an anecdote related to me by a teacher of maladjusted children. The incident took place in a Boy's Residential School near London, England. The teacher had established a warm, friendly relationship with a Negro boy. The lad felt that he had been abandoned by his parents and that they were responsable for his being sent to a residential school. The parents, who were "dark", personified to the boy all that was bad and evil. In a movement of anger, when overcome by feelings of rejection, the lad turned on the teacher (white), cursed, and called him, "You dirty, black bugger"!

Children aged four want to know who they are, consequently, they ask the persons whom they feel are most authoritative, their parents. They ask questions and expect answers. When these are vague and evasive, or their questions not answered at all, the child seeks answers from outside the home. If their questions are never satisfied, they may stop asking and retreat to their own fantasy world for answers. However, by the time the child can put into words the question" "Who am I"?, he already has some sense of himself as a person, and a sense of "mother" and "father", "sister", "brother" and "playmate", as outside the boundary of "me". The awareness of "self" emerges at an early age, and with it comes an awareness of others. An awareness of self embraces all that the "self"is, including skin color, type of hair and other physical characters. An awareness of self also brings with it an awareness of individual differences and the attitudes of persons towards those who have these differences.

The child at the age of four, has a social interest, an awareness of the attitudes and opinions of others, a consciousness of social milieu and social insight. He shows an interest in identifying, describing, classifying, evaluating and comparing himself and others. He knows his sex, color of skin and hair, age and personal attributes. He is already capable of making certain value judgements of right and wrong, good and bad, pretty and ugly, etc. He is on the way to learning the culture and values of the dominant society. This he may do consciously or unconsciously. The four year old is constantly exercising his eyes, ears and mind in recording the objective features of people things and behavior. He learns to choose the things and people he likes and to refuse those he dislikes. However, the things and people he chooses to like and dislike are usually those liked or disliked by the most influential member of his group or community.

Thus, children by the age of four are beginning to hold the same beliefs about Negroes as those held by the members of the dominant society. The racial beliefs, held in a given society may have no resemblance to the facts set out in research findings, or recorded in books on psychology, sociology and anthropology. But in the "real" world, the world in which the child exists, it is beliefs, not facts that count. Studies debunking racial superiority (or inferiority) are not usually read by the general public, and those who do read them are either already liberal in their thinking or too rigid to change.

At four years of age, children are already conscious of conspicuous features of people, recognize different racial traits and have begun to group people in terms of "we" and "them". However, when children speak of skin color they are making more than a mere description. When a child says his mother is "white", he knows that she is not literally white as, for example, a piece of chalk. A child observing a heterogeneous classroom may say: "There are two white children, the rest are Negroes, even when the Negro children range in color from very light to medium brown or ebony black. He classifies those as Negro not merely by pigmentation but by association and grouping them together because of certain traits which bind them all under the classification of "Negroes". He is aware that the Negro children in addition to skin and hair differences tend to "go-together", they have Negro brothers or sisters, mothers and

fathers or other relatives, and they live in the "Negro" neighborhood.

On seeing white and Negro children playing happily together, the uninformed or naive observer may sincerely believe that children are unaware of race. They are assured that children are racially innocent; they like to believe in the purity of childhood. As the Victorian Englishman was shocked at Freud's claim of infantile sexuality, the North American is equally shocked with the idea of precocious raciality. They would prefer to believe that children only learn prejudice from their prejudiced parents. They firmly advocate the education of parents as to the equality of men as a means of preventing an awareness of racial differences in their children. The findings of this study suggests that this belief may not be true. Furthermore, the schools do little to stimulate or prevent racial awareness, they prefer to avoid it. Race, like sex, is not discussed by "nice" people with "nice" children. The attitude towards race and sex has possibly changed since this study.[1]

A child's behavior towards members of a different racial group is not necessarily indicative of his attitudes toward that group. In order to know his real attitudes, the child must be provided with an opportunity to verbalize his true feelings. Even when parents are seemingly unprejudiced, and strongly feel that their children have no awareness of race, the author found that "A child... is clearly aware of what he calls, 'black people' and has strong feelings about them". Some children show" ...a rather consistent rejection of Negroes and are clearly aware that "blacks" are very different people from "whites". As expressed by a four-year old Negro girl, "The people that are white, they can go up; the people that are brown they have to go down..."

As children become aware of skin color and hair type, they begin to attach to these a preference value. This was manifested on showing the children pictures of dolls depicting white or brown people. They gave expressions of positive and negative valuing, and in no uncertain terms. For example, the white children used

---

1. This is especially true in certain Nègro communities in North America where there is a growing movement to teach the "facts" about race, especially the Black race.

such expressions as, "Black people, I hate'em". Negroes are perceived by the white children as being bad, dirty and inferior. They are also seen in much the same manner by the Negro children. Negro children generally have built up unpleasant associations around brownness and pleasant ones around whiteness. These feelings about color may be more related to cultural reasons than psychological ones. For in the North American society, adults tend to use phrases which imply that dark is negative and light is positive. Americans are cleanliness conscious. Black is equated with dirt, ugliness, evil and fear, while white is associated with purity, cleanliness, and all that is beautiful and good. This is also true in England. A distinguished British psychoanalyst related a case history of a distubed white lad who remarked, "Hell is a big black man"! "Black" is an emotionally loaded word, especially for children. And, in their fantasy life, there are always "ghosts and monsters" who scare or eat people and who lurk in dark place. Their faces are inevitably dark and virtually all children are afraid of the dark. Hence, the word "Black" becomes associated with a threatening situation, or a vicious person. The villian of melodrama is a dark man who seduces the fair maiden.

The children in this study applied a long list of unpleasant adjectives to Negro figures such as "rough", "funny", "stupid", "silly", "smelly", "stinky" and "dirty". Children —black or white— who use these adjectives may be anxiety free and apparently happy. But they seem to have sensed racial differences and some are already beginning to attach a value judgement to these differences.

Negro children, at times, show a desire to be light or white, however, it is exceedingly rare that a white child wants to be black, or even to possess any other distinctive Negro physical attribute.

Both white and Negro children are inquisitve about dark skin-color. "Why are they dark"? "Do they (Negroes) have to wash their hands?" "Does it (color) come off?"... are questions frequently asked by children. A Negro child may ask, "Why am I black?" However, the author states, "White children never ask about themselves. What their color is, or the lack of it." I have personally inquired of various white friends, if they or their children have ever asked why they were white (or not black). In

every case the answer was emphatically, No! White children, it seems, take their color for granted.

Negro children are offended if called "black", but white children are never hurt when called, "white". An angry Negro child may call another one, or even a white child, "You black so-and-so!" A white child would never curse a Negro, or a white one, by calling him a, "White so-and-so!"[1]

By the age of four, children are already beginning to acquire a sense of superiority and inferiority. The white children studied never felt inferior to the Negroes. The Negroes felt superior only to one another and never did they assume a position of superiority toward whites. It is interesting to compare this attitude of superiority-inferiority, as it is found amongst two minority groups: Negroes and Jews. Negro children at a very early age are aware of their differences. Jewish children in contrast must be told that they are Jews and therefore different. Unlike the Negro, their differences, their Jewishness indicate a superior rather than an inferior status. The Jewish child will receive instruction in the home about Jewish history and tradition and will learn to accept suffering from "them" the Gentiles; but this suffering is inflicted because "We are the chosen people". Jewish children are taught to be tolerant and are apt to be less prejudiced toward Negroes, than Negro children toward them. After all, the Jews are white and thus, in the Negro child's mind, they must share the same negative feelings as other whites toward Negroes. This feeling is incorporated in the formula: WHITE.
BLACK

The "White over Black" formula is recognized by all North Americans. It has seeped throughout the nation and along the line of the generations, and we can see it now seeping into our children, white and black. The superposition of the whites over the subordinate blacks is a universal phenomenon, and is felt in every society where there are found sufficient numbers of white and black individuals. It is also found among the homogeneous racial groups white and black. Amongst the white ethnic groups, the blond Nordics, Aryan, Teutonic and Anglo-Saxons are attributed the positive characteristics of the race and perceive themselves

1. Certain organizations amongst the Black communities in North America have initiated a systematic campaign in order to instill within its members, pride in being black.

superior to the Mediterraneans, Latins and Semitics. One Englishman can beat three Spaniards is a common saying in Britain. In America, among Negroes the lighter the skin, the higher the social position. A similar pattern is found throughout Latin America, including Puerto Rico.

Conclusion

The author, Dr. Goodman, after having made a careful analysis of the data collected, concluded that there is never a single cause, a single term in the personal history which alone determines the young child's interest in and knowledge of race and race differences, or his feelings about his own or another racial group. High awareness, strong feelings of racial antagonism will result from a combination of several factors working inwardly and outwardly. It is surprising that the word "prejudice" rarely appears in this book. The writer explains that the traditional concept of prejudice is an oversimplified one. Prejudice has various shades of meanings. It is felt in different degrees of intensity, and manifested in a wide variety of behavioral patterns, at times, without the person being consciously aware that he is prejudiced. But an awareness of racial difference must have existed at one time. For racial awareness is an inextricable component of racial prejudice. This study attempts to prove that such an awareness begins to emerge as early as the third or fourth year of childhood. To be racially aware is not to be racially obsessed. In fact, one may be racially aware without being racially prejudiced. But racial awareness is, I believe, the first step toward racial prejudice, and this step is taken, at least in North America, by the age of four.

I personally found the book very stimulating and enlightening. One cannot help wondering if the same findings would have been obtained if the study had been carried out in a contry other than North America, for example, in Britain or in Latin America, or if the examiners had been Negroes. In any case, all persons directly or indirectly concerned with educating children are well advised to read this book, and ponder its message. That is, if there is any hope of mitigating prejudice in a society, this can only be accomplished through the combined efforts of its members in the educating of the children. They must be led at an early age to realize that differences in skin color are not as important as the

similarity of purpose of man, i.e., to be able to develop and grow physically, intellectually and emotionally each according to his innate potential and the available opportunities in his society. And that this purpose cannot be fully achieved in a society where any of its members are subjected to racial prejudice.

Roberto E. Morán
University of Puerto Rico
Río Piedras, Puerto Rico
1969